stabilized—at what point we are seeing a reproducible representation of the subject's inhalation behavior. In designing our experiment we must determine what would be sufficient time within each period of data collection for the smoking behavior to stabilize, before introducing a new experimental condition. Other information which is related to experimental design involves what happens to baseline behavior, established on a smoker's own cigarette, following experimental conditions. Is there a return to baseline inhalation behavior or will the baseline readjust? Carry-over effects resulting from the use of repeated measures may occur and must be taken into account.

B. *Programming a dedicated minicomputer for data display and analysis.* The MINC/DECLAB minicomputer, expected to arrive early in 1981, will be used to store and display the quantities of information collected. Following our programming efforts, the computer will be customized to handle the high-speed analyses required for our specific needs.

II. Experiment # 11: Does the smoker demonstrate compensatory inhalation behavior in response to changes in the nicotine content of cigarette smoke?

The experimental design is repeated measures with an ABACA format—a powerful method for examining what happens to inhalation patterns when a smoker switches between cigarettes of high, low, and ultra-low nicotine delivery. Baseline measures will be taken on the smoker's own low delivery cigarette until we observe stable behavior. The smoker will then switch to an ultra-low or high delivery experimental cigarette for two weeks, the order of presentation being balanced across subjects. Following each experimental condition, the smoker will switch back to his own cigarette to re-establish baseline behavior. Our primary interest is in comparing one inhalation parameters of Condition B with Condition C, demonstrating differences due to nicotine delivery of the cigarette smoked. The other 3 conditions will mainly serve to make this information meaningful.

We will be collecting data for approximately 2 months on each subject. The study will begin early in 1981 and is expected to continue throughout the year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TOWNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, once again I take the floor to express to my colleagues and to the American people my deep disappointment with a decision made recently by the President of the Government of France to explode eight nuclear bombs in the South Pacific, and each bomb explosion is ten times more powerful than the nuclear bomb dropped on the city of Hiroshima.

Mr. Speaker, I have just learned from media reports that some 47 parliamentarians from Australia and 11 from New Zealand, and several more parliamentarians from Austria, Japan, Denmark and Germany—all plan to travel to French Polynesia to protest the proposed nuclear testing program by the French Government which will commence in September of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my support and commend the parliamentarians of all these countries for their commitment and convictions to tell the French government leaders that France's proposal to explode eight nuclear bombs is just plain wrong and contrary to the wishes of some 28 million men, women and children who live in this region of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to make an appeal to my colleagues to join me by traveling to French Polynesia and let the French Government know that nuclear testing in the middle of the Pacific Ocean is an outmoded, ridiculous, and simply a dangerous undertaking not only for the marine environment but the lives of the millions of men, women and children who live in the Pacific region.

Mr. Speaker, the President of France recently proclaimed that France was the homeland of the Enlightenment, and I have no doubt that some of the world's greatest thinkers—men of reason—men who appreciate and value human rights, and who respect the rights of others.

Mr. Speaker, again I ask—what possible reason is there to justify President Chirac's decision to explode eight nuclear bombs? He said in the interest of France—but what the concerns and higher interest of some 170 nations of the world that recognized the dangers of nuclear proliferation—the dangers of nuclear bombs being exploded in an environment that changes constantly because of seasons climatic conditions that produce earthquakes, hurricanes, cyclones; and another real serious danger to these French nuclear explosions, Mr. Speaker, is we have no idea what is going on below the base of this volcanic formation.

After some 139 nuclear explosions for the past 20 years inside the core of this volcanic formation—something has got to give—and if radioactive leakages start coming out of this volcanic formation within the next 10 years or even 50 years—my problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the 60 million French citizens living in France are going to continue enjoying the good things of life like drinking their French wines, while the millions of people who live in the Pacific are being subjected to radioactive contamination—let alone some 200,000 Polynesians, Tahitians, who incidentally are also French citizens—all, Mr. Speaker, are going to be the victims. Is this fair, Mr. Speaker?

Can Mr. Chirac honestly look at himself in the mirror—every morning and keep saying to himself that it is okay to nuke those islands out there in the Pacific, and that the lives of 200,000 French citizens in the Pacific are not important to the Government of France? What arrogance, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the minds of millions of people around the world—the Government of France has committed a most grevious error by authorizing an additional eight nuclear bomb explosions to take place in certain atolls in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this special appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and to my fellow Americans—make your voices heard—support the concerns of the millions of men, women, and children in the Pacific and around the world who do not support French nuclear tests—call and write letters to the Congress and the French Embassy here in Washington, DC—tell the leaders of France that exploding 1.2 million tons of TNT in an ocean environment is both dangerous, insane, and utter madness.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House Committee on International Relations will consider House Concurrent Resolution 80, which expresses the strong sense of the Congress for recognition of the concerns of the nations of the Pacific region—a recognition also of the environmental problems that will attend these additional nuclear bomb explosions—and to call upon the government of France to stop these nuclear tests since about 70 percent of the people of France do not want nuclear tests to take place, and countries from Asia, the Pacific region, the Western Hemisphere, Europe—all do not want France to resume nuclear testings.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 80, which already has the support of Members from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

U.S. DOUBTS FUEL FEAR OF COLLAPSE ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN—PHYSICISTS MEET TO REINFORCE STAND

(By Charles J. Hanley)

Weeks before they light the fuse in the far Pacific, the French have set off an explosion of global protest with their plan to resume nuclear weapons testing.

But the nuclear future may depend less on what happens on a Polynesian island in September than on the outcome of a secretive meeting last week at a California resort, where leading physicists gathered to try to help a wavering U.S. government take a stand on a global test ban.

These latest developments—a decision in France, indecision in America—have suddenly cast a shadow over international negotiations to conclude a comprehensive test ban treaty by late 1996.

The Polish chairman of those talks in Geneva sounds worried.

''It's possible,'' Ludwik Dembinski said of reaching the goal. ''But it will be very difficult.''

Fifty years after the first atomic test explosion in New Mexico, on July 16, 1945, the